



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ven*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,271	12/23/2003	Helmar Van Santen	081468-0307331	4441

909 7590 10/26/2006

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, HUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2851

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/743,271		VAN SANTEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hung Henry V. Nguyen		2851	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hung Henry V. Nguyen. (3)\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Jean Paul Hoffman. (4)\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 October 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 21-25,27-30 and 32-37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mizutani et al (US 2005/0264774) and Vogel et al (U.S.Pat. 6,867,844).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant submitted a proposed response and requested for reconsideration. Applicant newly argues that the rejection of claims 21, 22, 24, 30 and 33 should be withdrawn. Mizutani does not qualify as a reference against this application because Mizutani et al which is a continuation of the Mizutani et al PCT patent application PCT/JP03/15737 filed December 9, 2003, which was published in Japanese as PCT patent application publication W02004/053958 and its 102(e) (1) date is later than applicant's US filing date. The Examiner will perform an analysis of Mizutani's reference for its effective filing date, and the Examiner will withdraw the rejection of the above claims under the reference of Mizutani if applicant is correct. Turning to the 102 (e) rejection of claims 30, 33, 34, applicant argues that Vogel does not disclose the at least one immersion liquid outlet port being radially outwardly, relative to an optical axis of the projection system, of the at least one immersion liquid inlet port, as recited in claim 30. Applicant's arguments are found persuasive. Accordingly, the mentioned rejection is withdrawn. However, no agreement was reached for allowance, pending the Examiner's further review when an official response is filed.